

VZCZCXYZ0000
OO RUEHWEB

DE RUCNDT #0609/01 1710200

ZNR UUUUU ZZH

O 200200Z JUN 09

FM USMISSION USUN NEW YORK

TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC IMMEDIATE 6749

INFO RUEHGG/UN SECURITY COUNCIL COLLECTIVE IMMEDIATE

RUEHRL/AMEMBASSY BERLIN IMMEDIATE 1096

RUEHBR/AMEMBASSY BRASILIA IMMEDIATE 1144

RUEHIL/AMEMBASSY ISLAMABAD IMMEDIATE 2375

RUEHMD/AMEMBASSY MADRID IMMEDIATE 6412

RUEHNE/AMEMBASSY NEW DELHI IMMEDIATE 2675

RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME IMMEDIATE 1117

RUEHUL/AMEMBASSY SEOUL IMMEDIATE 1137

RUEHKO/AMEMBASSY TOKYO IMMEDIATE 8755

UNCLAS USUN NEW YORK 000609

SENSITIVE
SIPDIS

DEPARTMENT FOR USUN/W AND IO/UNP; NSC FOR POWER

E.O. 12958: N/A

TAGS: PREL KUNR UNGA UNSC GE JA BR IN

SUBJECT: UNGA: UNSC REFORM: SECOND ROUND OF
INTERGOVERNMENTAL NEGOTIATIONS FOCUS ON COMPOSITION ISSUES
OF SIZE, CATEGORIES OF MEMBERSHIP, AND REGIONAL
REPRESENTATION

REF: USUN NEW YORK 553

¶11. (SBU) Summary: The informal plenary of the General Assembly met on June 11 and 12 for the second meeting of the second round of intergovernmental negotiations (IGN) on Security Council reform, focusing on the three clustered issues of composition: size, categories of membership and regional representation. India and the African Group continued to focus on permanent seats with veto rights. There was a growing convergence on an expanded Council size in the mid-twenties. Germany, a Group of Four (G4) member, suggested a discussion of the intermediate option in the third round. The rest of the G4, India, Brazil and Japan, stayed on their group's core message in favor of expansion in both permanent and non-permanent categories, an expanded Council size of 25, and an interpretation of regional representation to mean equitable geographical distribution. France said the intermediate option could lead to new permanent seats - heretofore an unmentioned possibility. The U.S. reiterated its support for an expansion that will neither diminish the Council's effectiveness nor its efficiency. End summary.

¶12. (SBU) Comment: The process continues to proceed with little forward movement; more time is focused on rehashing well-known national positions. The Chair attempted in his overview paper before the start of the second round to focus the membership on those proposals with the greatest chance of garnering wide support but this effort met with widespread disagreement and complaints about the Chair's selectivity. During this meeting, the Uniting for Consensus bloc (UFC) members repeatedly suggested that the addition of permanent members did not enjoy broad support and therefore should be discarded, while G4 members (Brazil, India and Japan) and their supporters slung similar accusations about the UFC position. End comment.

¶13. (SBU) The informal plenary of the General Assembly met on June 11 and 12 for the second meeting of the second round of intergovernmental negotiations (IGN) on Security Council reform, focusing on the three clustered issues of composition: size, categories of membership and regional representation. 82 delegations spoke during this two-day exchange with nine interventions occurring during the interactive portion of the final day. The negotiations continue to be chaired by the Afghan Ambassador Zahir Tanin.

Size

¶4. (SBU) There was overwhelming focus on 25-27 as the size of an enlarged Council. The Philippines exceptionally proposed 31. Only eight states expressly proposed a size in the low-twenties - Australia, Belarus, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, the Netherlands, Slovakia, Switzerland and Russia. Ambassador DiCarlo reiterated the U.S. position that an expanded Council sized in the mid-twenties would be unwieldy and inefficient. (Comment: Many African states unconvincingly tried to dismiss the notion that an increase in size would lead to ineffectiveness, arguing that an improvement in Council working methods would ensure effectiveness. Noticeably, only one delegation outside the African Group (Malta) echoed this view. End Comment.)

Categories of membership:

G4 and UFC clash

¶5. (SBU) The G4 again reiterated that it seeks additional seats in both categories of membership: permanent and non-permanent. India remains the most vocal supporter for the G4 position, as it continues its campaign for a permanent seat with veto rights. The Uniting for Consensus (UFC) bloc, on the other hand, advocates an expansion of non-permanent seats only, in the hopes of shifting power away from the P5 to the elected members. They said this is in line with "the sovereign equality of member states."

Germany more open to
discussing intermediate option

¶6. (SBU) Germany was the only member of the G4 to signal a willingness to explore different variations of the intermediate option. The German Perm Rep called for further discussion in the third round of the negotiations on the intermediate option which he described as "a multi-faceted creature that seems to exist in many shapes and forms, some of which appear close to the permanent model." (Comment: Germany's openness should not be seen as a major policy change, merely an articulation of their readiness to move the negotiation discussion forward. End comment.) The rest of the G4, India, Brazil and Japan, stayed on their group's core message of expansion in both permanent and non-permanent categories, an expanded Council size of 25, and an interpretation of regional representation to mean equitable geographical distribution. UFC members, including Colombia and Italy, stressed that their intermediate option proposal focused solely on longer-term elected seats. Italy, like Germany, proposed devoting a full session to a discussion of the "intermediate option." Several other delegations (mostly UFC) seconded this. Most African States repeated the AU message and rejected the intermediate option, but Nigeria refrained from flatly rejecting it, saying it was open to examining other viewpoints.

Regional representation: really means
more equitable geographical distribution

¶7. (SBU) There appeared to be growing agreement that regional representation is better termed to mean more "equitable geographical distribution" as per Article 23(1) of the UN Charter. Brazil wanted to scrap the use of the term "regional representation" altogether and "work on the basis of the well-established notion of equitable geographical distribution." The Netherlands, Singapore, the Czech Republic and Germany explicitly addressed the inherent problems and confusion with the term saying, inter alia, that the phrase is not used in the UN Charter.

¶8. (SBU) Most African states repeated the AU position that the "AU is responsible for Africa's representation in the Council". Curiously, Namibia broke from this position and spoke at lengths about the benefits of a regional seat.

¶9. (SBU) Many delegations recognized the need for small island developing states would have a chance to serve on an expanded Council, however there was no agreement whether or not this would include a new seat specifically designated for small island developing states or if it would be handled within existing regional groups.

Philippines proposal - out in left field

¶10. (SBU) The Philippines Perm Rep read and circulated with his prepared statement a draft resolution amending Article 23 of the Charter to consist of 31 members - considerably larger than any arrangement widely discussed. According to the draft, regional groups would choose longer-term members to eventually become permanent members. (Comment: This would cross the USG redline that permanent members must be defined by name in any Security Council expansion proposal. End comment.) No other delegations took the time to comment on it, though he was the sixth speaker.

P5 Statements: France, U.K. and Russia willing to explore intermediate option

¶11. (SBU) During the interactive portion of the debate, France for the first time described the intermediate option as a "transition period," which could lead to permanent seats. The U.K. only said that it was ready to consider the "intermediate model," that it supports a modest expansion

balancing representation and effectiveness and that it would accept "extended seats." Russia joined France and the U.K in an explicit reference to looking further into what it called the "interim model." China's statement did not elucidate a position beyond the general platitudes about representation for developing countries, although it did say it supported giving priority to Africa.

U.S. statement

¶12. (SBU) Ambassador DiCarlo reiterated U.S. support for an expansion that will neither diminish the Council's effectiveness nor its efficiency. She stressed that the U.S. is open in principle to limited expansion of both permanent and non-permanent members, but believes that a Council in the mid-twenties would be unwieldy and diminish its effectiveness and efficiency. She underscored that the U.S. believes expansion in permanent membership must be country-specific in nature and based on contributions to the maintenance of international peace and security, and other purposes of the UN. While the U.S. is supportive of the role that regional organizations and regional representation play in the selection of elected members, viewing their role as providing de facto permanent regional representation, she noted that under Article 24(1) of the Charter, members of the Council act on behalf of the entire membership of the UN. She noted that the U.S. also remains committed to Article 23(1) in the election of non-permanent members with due regard to contributions to the maintenance of international peace and security and to other purposes of the organization and to equitable geographical distribution. She underscored that the U.S. also remains fully supportive of Article 18(2) which specifically defines the election of non-permanent members as an important question that requires a 2/3 majority of the entire membership, at least those present and voting. She added that whatever formula emerges, it must factor in Charter requirements for ratification. Ambassador DiCarlo closed by saying that the U.S. remains committed to a

serious, deliberate effort, working with other member states, to find a way forward that enhances the ability of the Security Council to carry out its mandate and effectively meet the challenges of the new century.

Next meeting

¶13. (SBU) The third meeting of the second round is scheduled for June 22. It will cover relations between General Assembly and Security Council, the veto, and the Security Council's working methods.

RICE